

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Dox 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	-ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/646,986		09/26/2000	Henning Vollert	02481.1699	3891
22852	7590	08/21/2003			
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER				EXAMINER	
LLP 1300 I STREET, NW				HANDY, DWAYNE K	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1743 DATE MAILED: 08/21/2003	N

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N .	Applicant(s)	_				
Advisory Action	09/646,986	VOLLERT, HENNING					
S Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Dwayne K Handy	1743					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	_				
THE REPLY FILED 25 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply to a h					
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension	า				
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offi timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai CFR 1.704(b).	originally set in the final Office action; or ling date of the final rejection, even if					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>25 July 2003</u> . Appearance of Appeara	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be							
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	•	see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the					
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceliNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT place the					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:	Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:	Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>5-13</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·					
10. Other:		•					
	an	LEN SODERQUIST					
	ARI Pri	LEN SODERQUIST MARY EXAMINER					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are insufficient to overcom the previous rejection made by the Examiner. Applicant has also argued that the previous action should not have been made final since new arguments were presented in the previous action. The Examiner disagrees. Applicant had assumed that the Examiner believev the claimed features were inherent in the reference used in the rejection. The Examiner merely confirmed applicant's assumption and stated how the assumption was justified in Response to Arguments..